REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 19, and 21-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, 24 and 26 are independent. Claims 31-35 are withdrawn. Claims 4, 8-18, 20 and 27-40 are canceled.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-7.

Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 24 and 26 because "selected" should be inserted before "disengagement"; and "~~and re-engagement~~" should be deleted. Applicants have amended claims 24 and 26 per the Examiner's suggestions, thereby obviating the objection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19, 21-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Williams U.S. Patent No. 5,669,336 ("Williams").

Williams discloses a compliant drive for powering a cooling fan of an internal combustion engine. However, independent claims 19, 24 and 26 are specifically directed to a supercharger. In particular, the preambles for these claims call for "A supercharger..." On the other hand, the Williams reference is directed to an internal combustion engine. Williams makes no reference to a supercharger, whether directly or impliedly. Therefore, Williams cannot be said to anticipate claims 19, 24 and 26. In addition, each of these claims positively recites "a drive pulley coupled to the supercharger". Given that Williams make no reference to a

supercharger, it follows that Williams does not provide a drive pulley that is coupled to a supercharger. Moreover, the art of supercharger design is quite specialized, separate, and distinct from the art of vehicle engines. Additionally, the art of fan drives is very specialized, separate and distinct from vehicle engines. As these arts are separate and distinct, one cannot possibly anticipate advantages in the other.

It is hereby respectfully submitted that Williams fails to qualify as prior art as it is nonanalogous and therefore cannot be used in the rejection of the present invention. In order to rely upon a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem concerned. *In Re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446. (The *Oetiker* court held that the reference (a hook for garments) was neither within applicant's field of endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned because one of ordinary skill, seeking to solve the problem of fastening a hose clamp, would not reasonably be expected or motivated to turn to the garment industry to find a fastener).

Similar to *Oetiker*, the cited reference (Williams) is not in the field of the endeavor, and it is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem concerned. On one hand, the field of endeavor of the present invention concerns the use of an over-running device for a supercharger to assist in stabilizing a precision high-speed spindle assembly during racing or competition. On the other hand, Williams is concerned with a compliant fan drive for an internal combustion engine that is used to reduce or eliminate a slack section or bubble in the drive belt between the fan's drive hub and the crankshaft pulley. One of ordinary skill, seeking to assist in stabilizing a precision high-speed spindle assembly of a supercharger during racing, would not be reasonably

expected or motivated to look to a compliant fan drive for an internal combustion engine for a solution. On this basis, it is unreasonable to reject the present application based on Williams.

As discussed hereinabove, Williams teaches a "compliant fan drive" that is primarily intended to reduce or eliminate "...a slack section or 'bubble' of drive belt between the fan's drive hub and the crankshaft pulley." Another objective is to reduce or eliminate the belt's "...objectionable chirping noise as if it slips on the crankshaft pulley." Williams invention fails to provide an advantage to the supercharger art. If the claims of the present invention recited the use of an overrunning clutch in a low-powered belt drive system to provide advantages for aiding belt system stability and/or reduction of belt noise, then the use of Williams may be proper. However, the claims are not drawn to an overrunning clutch in a low-powered belt drive system to provide advantages for aiding belt system stability and/or reduction of belt noise.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully set forth that Williams fails to anticipate claims 19, 21-24 and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Thompson U.S. Patent No. 2,718,952 ("Thompson").

Williams is distinguished from the present invention as set forth above with respect to claims 19, 21-24 and 26. Thompson fails to cure the deficiencies of Williams and, for this reason, claim 25 is not obvious over Williams in view of Thompson.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims is solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this and concurrent replies to charge payment (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 50-0683 for any additional required fees.

Respectfully submitted,

9-8-2005
Date

David E. Heisey
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,651
c/o LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP
600 West Broadway, Suite 2600
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone No.: (619) 233-2984

2095415.1